



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,292	08/27/2001	Kenneth C. Creta	81674-276924	6722
27496	7590	03/10/2004	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP 725 S. FIGUEROA STREET SUITE 2800 LOS ANGELES, CA 90017			AUVE, GLENN ALLEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2111	9
DATE MAILED: 03/10/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/940,292	CRETA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Glenn A. Auve	2111	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Glenn A. Auve. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Stephen Byers, Applicant's Attorney. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 March 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Neal & EE Times article.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,

(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Interview addressed several points as set forth in applicant's request for interview (attached). With respect to points 1 and 2 in the request, applicant will explain in their response how they believe the Neal reference does not show a coherent interface and explain how they believe that Neal does not show an unordered domain. With respect to points 3 and 4, it was noted that the language of claim 8 indicates that the "intermediary device" is included in the I/O hub, but applicant's attorney believes that the system entails the hub being connected to a bridge which constitutes the "intermediary device" that is not part of the hub. The examiner gave no opinion regarding whether this distinction would overcome the prior art, and the examiner also gave no opinion regarding the equating of the hub in applicant's claims to the bridge in the Neal reference as was done in the rejection. With regard to point 5 and the EE Times article the examiner stated that there is nothing currently in the record to indicate that the subject of the EE Times article is actually the invention of the application, and that an affidavit will be necessary to overcome the reference. Applicant's attorney will prepare an affidavit, possibly by the original attorney in the case to attempt to remove the EE Times article as a reference.



725 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET SUITE 2800 LOS ANGELES, CA 90017-5406 213.488.7100 F: 213.629.1033

FACSIMILE

Total Pages (including cover): 2+cover

HOUSTON	Date:	March 3, 2004	Must Be Sent By:	ASAP
LONDON	To:	Glenn Auve	Fax No:	703-746-5659
LOS ANGELES	Company:	USPTO	Phone No:	703-305-4815
NEW YORK	From:	Stephen D. Byers	Phone No:	(213) 488-7532
NORTHERN VIRGINIA	User No:	14870	C/M No:	081674-0276924
ORANGE COUNTY	Comments:			
SACRAMENTO	Examiner Auve,			
SAN DIEGO	Unless you suggest otherwise, I will call you at 11 am PST (2 pm EST) on March 8, 2004 to discuss Application No. 09/940,292.			
SAN FRANCISCO				
SILICON VALLEY				
SINGAPORE				
STAMFORD				
SYDNEY				
TOKYO				
WASHINGTON DC	Thanks for your consideration of this manner,			

MR 3 11 22

Confidentiality Note:
 The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission may contain confidential information which is legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in this transmission is strictly PROHIBITED. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and mail the original transmission to us. Thank you.

If you have not properly received this fax, please call (213) 488-7577. Thank you.

Operator: _____ Time Sent: _____ Batch ID: _____

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/940,292 First Named Applicant: Creta
 Examiner: Auve, Glenn Art Unit: 2111 Status of Application: Pending - 1st O.A.

Tentative Participants:

(1) Steve Byers (2) Glenn Avue
 (3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: 3/8/04 Proposed Time: 11:00 (AM/PM) PST
2:00 PM EST

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) Telephonic (2) Personal (3) Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: YES

NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>1-25</u>	<u>Neal</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	<u>EE Times</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

On Attached Sheet

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on 3/8/2004

NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

[Signature]
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

[Signature]
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 172 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

TALKING POINTS FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW ON MARCH 3, 2004

- 1) The Neal reference does not disclose a coherent interface.
- 2) An unordered domain entails more than just sending inbound and outbound transactions in a nonsequential order.
- 3) The Neal reference is not an I/O hub, it is a bridge. Notice that most of the specification discusses Figure 20, and Figure 20 is a bridge. The I/O hub of the present invention is connected to bridges (such as the Intel P64H2, Hub Interface-to-PCI Bridge as discussed in the Specification of the present invention at page 4). The Neal reference cannot disclose a Hub and a Bridge being the same.
- 4) The Examiner states that the Producer-Consumer Interface is inherent in the fact that Neal is for use in a PCI system, and then in claim 8 states that Neal shows an intermediary device interconnecting the Producer Consumer ordered interface and an I/O device. Where exactly is the intermediary device in Fig 2? What is the P-C interface in Fig. 2? Furthermore, the intermediary device must be separate from the I/O hub (which currently my understanding is that the Examiner believes Bridge 20 is the I/O hub) If that is the case, nothing in Fig. 2 shows anything other than the Bridge 20 so how can it show the intermediary device?
- 5) The Examiner states that the EE Times article is prior art. While it was published 4 days before the filing date, the article is not prior art. The article is a third person describing the very same invention in the present application, so it would be impossible for it to describe the invention before the date of invention (becoming prior art under 102(a)) when it is talking about the very same invention. Applicants note that this could be overcome with an affidavit, however, doing so will needlessly waste the Applicant's time and money when it is apparent that the article cannot be describing the product before it is invented. The Applicant would appreciate the Examiner taking these conditions into consideration when evaluating the need to file an affidavit.
- 6) Are there any amendments that the Examiner proposes would distinguish the claims from the cited reference(s)?